REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Claims 1-26 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claims 1, 16-18, 21, and 25 have been amended, and claims 27 and 28 have been added.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Barrett

Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2003/0135490 by Barrett et al. ("Barrett").

Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite:

> A computer-implemented method for ranking information, comprising:
>
> identifying an input signal indicating an interest in a first piece of information in a collection of information associated with a plurality of search queries;
>
> determining a search query associated with the first piece of information;
>
> adjusting a query factor associated with the search query associated with the first piece of information responsive to the input signal;
>
> determining a search query associated with a second piece of information from the collection;
>
> determining whether the search query associated with the first piece of information and the search query associated with the second piece of information are the same; and
>
> if the search query associated with the first piece of information and the search query associated with the second piece of information are the same,

determining a score for the second piece of information based at least in part on the query factor associated with the search query associated with the first piece of information, and

ranking the collection of information based on the score.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for ranking information that includes identifying an input signal indicating an interest in a first piece of information associated with a search query, and adjusting a query factor associated with the search query responsive to the input signal. The method then determines whether a search query associated with a second piece of information and the search query associated with the first piece of information are the same. If the search queries are the same, claim 1 further recites determining a score for the second piece of information based at least in part on the query factor, and ranking information associated with multiple search queries based on the score. Likewise, independent claims 18 and 25 recite the claimed features cited above.

The claimed feature of adjusting a query factor associated with a search query responsive to an input signal indicating an interest in a first piece of information associated with the search query is beneficial in ranking information associated with multiple search queries. If a user is interested in one piece of information, he tends to be also interested in other information associated with the same search query, because the information tends to share common characteristics that interest the user. Therefore, the input signal may also indicate an interest in other information associated with the same search query as the first piece of information. Thus, by adjusting the query factor associated with the search query responsive to the input signal, determining a score for a second piece of information associated with the search query based on the query factor, and ranking information associated with multiple search queries based on the score, claim 1 may rank the information

associated with the search query higher than those associated with other search queries. As a result, the information likely will interest the user (those associated with the search query) may be prioritized over the rest by the method recited in claim 1.

Barrett, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed features of adjusting a query factor associated with a search query. Barrett, in contrast, discloses a method for determining an enhanced popularity score and using it to rank information. See Barrett, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]. In Barrett, an enhanced popularity score is created based on hypothetical enhanced popularity scores which are created based on key terms and web sites. See Barrett, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0034] ("The present invention maintains two different hypothetical enhanced popularity scores for each key term for each site."). Web sites are not associated with search queries. A key term may belong to multiple search queries and a search query may have multiple key terms. See Barrett, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0047] (different search queries may share enhanced popularity score if they share key terms). Thus, the enhanced popularity scores in Barrett are different from the query factor recited in claim 1.

Barrett also fails to disclose the claimed feature of ranking information associated with multiple queries based on a score for a piece of information determined based on a query factor. Barrett discloses ranking information of a search query using enhanced popularity scores, and is totally silent as to ranking information associated with multiple search queries. The query factor associated with a search query as recited in claim 1 is adjusted responsive to an input signal indicating an interest in a piece of information associated with the search query. Therefore, the score determined based on the query factor and the ranking based on the score beneficially reflect potential user interest in information

associated with the search query. Examiner cited paragraphs [0041], [0047] through [0049] of Barrett for teaching this element. However, the cited paragraphs only disclose a method to index information using enhanced popularity score and to rank information based on the index, and is totally silent as to ranking information associated with multiple queries based on a score based on a query factor. See Barrett, paragraph [0041] ("The scores of information related to a particular query are compared and the associated information is ranked based on the scores.").

In view of the above, Barrett fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 25. Thus, independent claims 1, 18 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants have added new claims 27 and 28 for which Applicants request consideration and examination. Applicants respectfully submit that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants believe they are entitled.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-28, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stephen R. Lawrence, et al.

Date: _____ September 5, 2007 ____ By: _____ /Jie Zhang/ _____

Jie Zhang, Reg. No.: 60,242
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200